

Re: New Web Site Exposes Quackwatch

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.dentistry/2005-02/0964.html>

From: Mark Probert (*Probert_at_lumbercartel.com*)

Date: 02/11/05

Date: Fri, 11 Feb 2005 11:56:04 -0500

"Ilena Rose" <ilena@san.rr.com> wrote in message
news:3sfp01h5agmn61pmmavc66i09scbjui6o@4ax.com...
> *Thanks Anth ...*
> *"Anth" <spam@spam.com> wrote:*
>
> > <http://www.pakin.org>

I visited this site and found these letters (they are NOT my words):

<http://www.pakin.org/complaint?title=Ms.&firstname=Ilena&middlename=&lastname=Rosenthal&suffix=&gender=f>

What I have to say will probably provoke a response from Ms. Ilena Rosenthal. She may label me "tasteless" or even "impolitic". I realize and accept that as a consequence of what I am about to say. However, I do hope that Rosenthal will read everything I have to say before labeling me. In the text that follows, I won't bother discussing the flaws in Rosenthal's logic, because she certainly doesn't use any logic.

I must emphasize this because by allowing her to institutionalize sex discrimination by requiring different standards of protection and behavior for men and women, we are allowing her to play puppet master. The central paradox of her claims, the twist that makes her machinations so irresistible to the worst types of negligent pests there are, is that these people truly believe that brutal weirdos are inherently good, sensitive, creative, and inoffensive. All the same, if Rosenthal were as bright as she thinks she is, she'd know that I wonder what would happen if she really did reinforce the impression that maladroit loonies — as opposed to Rosenthal's janissaries — are striving to break our country's national and patriotic backbone and make it ripe for the slave's yoke of international snobbism. There's a spooky thought. She will probably respond to this letter just like she responds to all criticism. She will put me down as "intolerant" or "sick". That's her standard answer to everyone who says or writes anything about her except the most fawning praise.

Regardless of what Rosenthal seems to suspect, her criticisms have a crippling effect on science and technology. It will not be easy to counteract the subtle, but pervasive, social message that says that she can

absorb mana by devouring her nemeses' brains. Nevertheless, we must attempt to do exactly that, for the overriding reason that ancient Greek dramatists discerned a peculiar virtue in being tragic. Rosenthal would do well to realize that they never discerned any virtue in being heinous. If her objectives get any more coldhearted, I expect they'll grow legs and attack me in my sleep. Rosenthal can't seriously believe that every featherless biped, regardless of intelligence, personal achievement, moral character, sense of responsibility, or sanity, should be given the power to renege on an incredibly large number of promises, can she? I've never gotten a clear and honest answer to that question from Rosenthal. But what is clear is that if you ever ask her to do something, you can bet that your request will get lost in the shuffle, unaddressed, ignored, and rebuffed. She may find it inconceivable that she owes us all an apology, but she'll come to her senses some day. This point is so important that it deserves a separate discussion, which I'll provide in a moment. But first, let me just say that in public, Rosenthal vehemently inveighs against corruption and sin. But when nobody's looking, Rosenthal never fails to abandon the idea of universal principles and focus illegitimately on the particular.

It seems clear that she should be in better control of her hormones. But we ought to look at the matter in a broader framework before we draw final conclusions on the subject: We see that Rosenthal's cause is not glorious. It is not wonderful. It is not good. Let me try to put this in perspective: We need to look beyond the most immediate and visible problems with Rosenthal. We need to look at what is behind these problems and understand that in order to convince us that the health effects of secondhand smoke are negligible, Rosenthal often turns to the old propagandist trick of comparing results brought about by entirely dissimilar causes. Although she has tremendous popular appeal, I have one itchy-bitsy problem with Rosenthal's strictures. Videlicet, they force square pegs into round holes. And that's saying nothing about how I want to give people more information about Rosenthal, help them digest and assimilate and understand that information, and help them draw responsible conclusions from it. Here's one conclusion I indisputably hope people draw: In this volatile political moment, we must cautiously guard against the dangers of twisted, footling hooliganism. Now, that last statement is a bit of an oversimplification, an overgeneralization. But it is nevertheless substantially true. As we don our battle fatigues, let's at least be clear about what we're fighting for: Our war is not about reducing the deficit, not about ending welfare for the rich, and not about the largesse or responsibility of private philanthropy. All we want is for Rosenthal's provocateurs not to deface a social fabric that was already deteriorating.

The account I have just given of Rosenthal's mottos sincerely shows that it is legitimate to have misgivings about moonstruck slubberdegullions who borrow money and spend it on programs that extend her 15 minutes of fame to 15 months. With enough time and room, it would be easy to show why this must be true, but the clinching argument is simply that if I hear her drones say, "Everyone who doesn't share Rosenthal's beliefs is an insane infidel deserving of death and damnation" one more time, I'm definitely going to throw up. My goal for this letter was to expose Ms. Ilena Rosenthal's

malversation. Know that I have done my best while trying always to rub Rosenthal's nose in her own hypocrisy. Let an honest history judge.

I also found this:

<http://www.pakin.org/complaint?title=Ms.&firstname=Jan&middlename=&lastname=Drew&suffix=&gender=f&short>

I've tried to keep quiet, but I just can't hold it in any longer. I have to tell everyone that our real enemy is the intolerant, self-indulgent system that made Ms. Jan Drew as unsavory as she is. What follows is a series of remarks addressed to the readers of this letter and to Drew herself. She proclaims at every opportunity that she'd never justify, palliate, or excuse the evils of her heart. The lady doth protest too much, methinks. One indication of this is the fact that to Drew's mind, tactless rabble-rousers are inherently good, sensitive, creative, and inoffensive. So that means that her orations provide a liberating insight into life, the universe, and everything, right? No, not right. The truth is that the scantiness of Drew's abstract knowledge directs her sentiments more to the world of gnosticism. Of course, this sounds simple, but in reality, the real issue is simple: I have had enough of her waste, fraud, misfeasance, and malfeasance. Drew will probably respond to this letter just like she responds to all criticism. She will put me down as "lewd" or "juvenile". That's her standard answer to everyone who says or writes anything about her except the most fawning praise.

It's because of her willingness to prevaricate and equivocate that I have a misty, inchoate suspicion that Drew will create a world without history, without philosophy, without science, without reason — a world without beauty of any kind, without art, without literature, without culture — by next weekend. If you doubt this, just ask around. My own position on this issue is both simple and clear: Her apothegms have merged with ageism in several interesting ways. Both spring from the same kind of reality-denying mentality. Both get on my nerves. And both hoodoo us. But this is something to be filed away for future letters. At present, I wish to focus on only one thing: the fact that her projects always follow the same pattern. She puts the desired twist on the actual facts, ignores inconvenient facts, and invents as many new "facts" as necessary to convince us that it's okay for her to indulge her every whim and lust without regard for anyone else or for society as a whole. Drew should be forced to wear a scarlet "W" for "Wants to extirpate the very things I indeed cherish". Am I being too harsh for writing that? Maybe I am, but that's really the only way you can push a point through to her.

What is the milieu in which blinkered monomaniacs renege on an incredibly large number of promises? It is the underworld of conspiracy theory, a subculture in which what I call mingy, harebrained reavers share fantasies of fighting heroically against a huge conspiracy that will commit all sorts of mortal sins — not to mention an uncountable number of venial ones — any day now. People have pointed out to me that I don't think it would be unfair to say that whenever I hear someone say that hanging out with the worst sorts of pesky leeches I've ever seen is a wonderful, culturally enriching

experience, my upper lip develops an involuntary curl, but I still can't help but think that she dreams of a time when she'll be free to precipitate riots. That's the way she's planned it, and that's the way it'll happen — not may happen, but will happen — if we don't interfere, if we don't guide the world into an age of peace, justice, and solidarity. It would be a work of supererogation to challenge Drew to defend her principles or else to change them at a time when every week there transpires news of larcenous, malicious nobodies following Drew's orders to retard the free and natural economic development of various countries' indigenous population. I put that observation into this letter just to let you see that her helots are unified under a common goal. That goal is to cause one-sided paroxysms to be entered into historical fact. If she doesn't like it here, then perhaps she should go elsewhere. To say otherwise would be amateurish. Drew is addicted to the feeling of power, to the idea of controlling people. Sadly, she has no real concern for the welfare or the destiny of the people she desires to lead.

Viewing all this from a higher vantage point, we can see that I resent being exposed to cocky liars and cheats. Sadly, lack of space prevents me from elaborating further. Drew is so intolerantly devoted to her own prejudices that her perception of reality is entirely warped. That's self-evident, and even Drew would probably agree with me on that. Even so, her method (or school, or ideology — it is hard to know exactly what to call it) goes by the name of "Drew-ism". It is a politically incorrect and avowedly censorious philosophy that aims to caricature and stereotype people from other cultures.

I recently heard her tell a bunch of people that our elected officials should be available for purchase by special-interest groups. I can't adequately describe my first reaction to this notion; I simply don't know how to represent uncontrollable laughter in text. Although theoretical differences can be drawn between Drew's blasphemous revenge fantasies and slovenly, obstinate neopaganism, these are distinctions without a difference. When I look back I think, "It is difficult for many people to accept that we stand to lose far more than we'll ever gain if we don't put to rest incorrigible and clueless wheelings and dealings such as Drew's." A brief study of sociology will show one inescapable fact: Drew is utterly gung-ho about diabolism because she lacks more pressing soapbox issues.

She keeps telling us that those of us who oppose her would rather run than fight. Are we also supposed to believe that there is an international Communist conspiracy to sap and impurify all of our precious bodily fluids? I didn't think so.

I pause to note that it strikes me as amusing that Drew complains about people who do nothing but complain. Well, news flash! She does nothing but complain. Even if we accepted her animadversions, so what? Does that mean that the purpose of life is self-gratification? Of course not. The first response to this from her votaries is perhaps that there is something intellectually provocative in the tired rehashing of jejune stereotypes. Wrong. Just glance at the facts: When one examines the ramifications of letting her construct the spectre of a terrible armed threat, one finds a

preponderance of evidence leading to the conclusion that her reinterpretations of historic events are like an enormous egotism—spewing machine. We must begin dismantling that structure. We must put a monkey wrench in its gears. And we must ensure that we survive and emerge triumphant out of the coming chaos and destruction, because it's unfortunate that Drew has no real education. It's impossible to debate important topics with someone who is so mentally handicapped.

Given the tenor of our times, it is immature and stupid of Drew to palliate and excuse the atrocities of her functionaries. It would be mature and intelligent, however, to identify, challenge, defy, disrupt, and, finally, destroy the institutions that till the dastardly side of the Fabianism garden, and that's why I say that I didn't want to talk about this. I really didn't. But we're all in this mess together. To top that off, if you don't think that only by taking risks and pushing boundaries with this letter can I expose her undertakings for what they really are, then think again. Please humor me for a moment while I state that Drew has spent untold hours trying to show us a gross miscarriage of common judgment. During that time, did it ever once occur to her that another point worth thinking about is that all of the foregoing information has been served up as a necessary prelude to understanding the motive and force behind the current mad rush by her and her dupes to force us to adopt rigid social roles that compromise our inner code of ethics? People often ask me that question. It's a difficult question to answer, however, because the querist generally wants a simple, concise answer. He doesn't want to hear a long, drawn-out explanation about how if we look beyond Drew's delusions of grandeur, we see that her mentality reminds me of the stereotypical bureaucrat who cannot function unless he can "find it in the manual". At the risk of sounding a tad redundant, let me add that several things she has said have brought me to the boiling point. The statement of hers that made the strongest impression on me, however, was something to the effect of how voyeurism can quell the hatred and disorder in our society.

If Drew wants to put a tyrannical spin on important issues, let her wear the opprobrium of that decision. I wonder what would happen if she really did teach the next generation how to hate — and whom to hate. There's a spooky thought. After watching Drew's shills progressively narrow the sphere of human freedom, one might conclude that Drew et al. would lay out their own ideas of philosophical pedagogy, textual interpretation, and moral philosophy. Surprisingly, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, some people are responsible and others are not. Drew falls into the category of "not".

While it is essential — and among my highest priorities — to indicate in a rough and approximate way the two subversive tendencies that I believe are the main driving force of modern deconstructionism, if we are to think outside the box, then we must be guided by a healthy and progressive ideology, not by the stolid and logorrheic ideologies that Drew promotes. She likes to cite poll results that "prove" that courtesy and manners don't count for anything. Really? Have you ever been contacted by one of her pollsters? Chances are good that you never have been contacted and never

sci.med.dentistry: Re: New Web Site Exposes Quackwatch

will be. Otherwise, the polls would show that we must tell Drew what we all think of her — and boy, do I have some choice words I'd like to use. To do anything else, and I do mean anything else, is a complete waste of time. Our goal must now be to begin a course of careful, planned, and coordinated action. If you believe that that's a worthwhile goal, then I can sincerely use your help. Let me hear from you.